

## Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

### Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

#### Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. **Date of Submission:** 2010-03-19 13:01:03

2. **Agency:** 015

3. **Bureau:** 35

4. **Name of this Investment:** Oracle e-Business Suite

5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier:** 015-35-01-01-01-1171-24

6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2011?:** Mixed Life Cycle

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? \***

8. **Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.**

Oracle e-Business Suite is a web-enabled COTS application providing an integrated accounting, budgeting, and reporting system comprising multiple subsystems. The system enables financial management of budget execution, purchasing, accounts payable, accounts receivable, disbursements, fixed assets, and inventory and order management. Functions in Oracle are accounted for on a general ledger double entry accounting basis and allow for management reporting in addition to required external reporting. Oracle was deployed into production in October 2002 and has been integrated with many key feeder systems. This investment closes a performance gap by allowing Public Debt to fulfill customer expectations through: the production of accurate and timely information to support operating, budget, and policy decisions; improved customer service to meet the needs of other government agencies and thus allowing those agencies to focus on mission-related activities; and improved clarity, utility, and availability of Federal financial information. Public Debt is a shared service provider for the FMLoB. Oracle is self-funded and not supported by any appropriated dollars.

- a. **Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register.**

9. **Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? \***

- a. **If "yes," what was the date of this approval? \***

10. **Contact information of Program/Project Manager?**

- **Name:** \*
- **Phone Number:** \*
- **Email:** \*

11. **What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)? \***

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-PMPM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.

- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/OM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

**12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):**

Financial management system name(s)	System acronym	Unique Project Identifier (UPI) number
*	*	*

a. **If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMI compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one): \***

- computer system security requirement;
- internal control system requirement;
- core financial system requirement according to FSIO standards;
- Federal accounting standard;
- U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level;
- this is a core financial system, but does not address a FFMI compliance area;
- Not a core financial system; does not need to comply with FFMI

## Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT PHASES</b> <b>(REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b> (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011	BY+1 2012	BY+2 2013	BY+3 2014	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SUBTOTAL:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL(including FTE costs)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2010 President's Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

\*

## Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table 1: Contracts/Task Orders Table

Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)
TPDARCBPA070007	FFP: Firm Fixed Price	Y	2007-03-15	2007-03-15	2012-03-14	\$1.9	*	*	*	*	*
TPD-ARC-08-K-00019	FFP: Firm Fixed Price	Y	2008-07-25	2008-07-25	2018-07-24	\$100.5	*	*	*	*	*

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

\*

3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? \*

a. If "yes," what is the date? \*

## Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2003	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	(1) One financial audit using Oracle Financials resulting in no material weaknesses. (2) Maintain monthly closings within 3 days. (3) Increase the number of agencies using the system. (4) Maintain or reduce the annual service cost per system user.	(1) No financial audits conducted on agencies using Oracle Financials. (2) Monthly closings within 3 days. (3) 5 agencies using Oracle Federal Financials. (4) Actual annual cost per user was \$28,150.	(1) Annually, track external audit findings. (2) Monthly, track timeliness of month-end closings. (3) Annually, track agencies using Oracle. (4) Annually, calculate average cost per user to measure cost effectiveness of shared service arrangement.	(1) One financial statement audit conducted with no internal control findings. (2) Month-end closings were within 3 days, except at year-end. (3) Number of agencies using Oracle is 11. (4) Average annual cost per user was estimated at \$3,560.
2004	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	(1) 3 additional financial audits using Oracle Financials resulting in no material weaknesses. (2) Monthly closings within 3 days. (3) Increase the number of agencies using the system. (4) Maintain or reduce the annual service cost per system user.	(1) One financial audit conducted on agencies using Oracle Financials, with no material weaknesses. (2) Monthly closings within 3 days. (3) 11 agencies implemented on Oracle Federal Financials. (4) Actual annual cost per user of \$3,560.	(1) Annually, track external audit findings. (2) Monthly, track timeliness of month-end closings. (3) Annually, track agencies using Oracle. (4) Annually, calculate average cost per user to measure cost effectiveness of shared service arrangement.	(1) 11 financial statement audits and SAS70 Review with no internal control findings. (2) Month-end closings within 3 days, except at year-end. (3) Number of agencies using Oracle is 18. (4) Average annual cost per user estimated at \$2,740.
2005	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Monthly closings within 3 days.	Monthly closings within 3 days.	Monthly, track the timeliness of month-end closings.	Monthly closings were performed within 3 days, except at year-end.
2005	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Increase by six (6) the number of agencies using the new system.	17 agencies implemented on Oracle Federal Financials.	Annually, track the number of agencies implemented on Oracle Financials.	Total of 28 agencies implemented on Oracle Federal Financials as of 09/30/05.
2006	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	28 closings each month within 3 days.	26 closings each month within 3 days.	Maintain the timeliness of monthly closing; currently tracking closings for 28 customers	As of 9/30/2006 we are performing 26 closings in 3 days.
2006	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Increase by one (1) the number of agencies using the new	Over 28 agencies implemented on Oracle Federal	Annually, track the number of agencies implemented on	Total of 31 agencies implemented on Oracle Federal

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
				system.	Financials.	Oracle Financials.	Financials as of 9/30/2006.
2007	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Number of closings each month within 3 days.	28	31	31
2007	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of financial audits resulting in no material weaknesses for Public Debt.	95	95	100
2008	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Number of closings each month within 3 days	28	31	28
2008	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of financial audits resulting in no material weaknesses for Public Debt.	95	95	100
2009	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Number of closings each month within 3 days.	28	29	31
2009	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of financial audits resulting in no material weaknesses for Public Debt.	95	95	100
2006	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Customer satisfaction rating of excellent and good in 90% range for all responses.	No baseline	Annually, track customer satisfaction through a survey	Customer satisfaction rating of 86% in the excellent and good range for all responses.
2007	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Average call response time (seconds) for system support.	40	40	7.62
2008	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Average call response time (seconds) for system support.	10	10	8
2009	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Average call response time (seconds) for system support.	8	8	7.58
2007	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of system availability per quarter	99.0	99.0	99.9
2008	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of system availability per quarter	99.0	99.0	99.98
2009	Effectively Managed U.S.	*	*	Percentage of system	99.98	99.0	99.90

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Government Finances			availability per quarter			
2010	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Number of closings each month within 3 days.	28	29	30
2010	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of financial audits resulting in no material weaknesses for Public Debt	95	95	100
2010	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Average call response time (seconds) for system support.	8	8	6.95
2010	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of system availability per quarter.	99.99	99	99.78
2011	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Number of closings each month within 3 days.	28	29	TBD
2011	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of financial audits resulting in no material weaknesses for Public Debt.	95	95	TBD
2011	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Average call response time (seconds) for system support.	8	8	TBD
2011	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of system availability per quarter.	99.99	99	TBD
2012	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Number of closings each month within 3 days.	28	29	TBD
2012	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of financial audits resulting in no material weaknesses for Public Debt.	95	95	TBD
2012	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Average call response time (seconds) for system support.	8	8	TBD
2012	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of system availability per quarter.	99.99	99	TBD
2013	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Number of closings each month within 3 days.	28	29	TBD

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2013	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of financial audits resulting in no material weaknesses for Public Debt.	95	95	TBD
2013	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Average call response time (seconds) for system support.	8	8	TBD
2013	Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances	*	*	Percentage of system availability per quarter.	95	95	TBD



## Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

### Section A: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
FY07 Operations and Maintenance	\$4.0	\$10.9	2006-10-01	2006-10-01	2007-09-30	2007-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY08 System Component (Customer reporting, interface & extension) Upgrades Design & Development	\$2.4	\$2.2	2007-10-01	2007-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY08 System Component (Customer reporting, interface & extension) Upgrades Testing	\$1.3	\$1.2	2007-10-01	2007-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY08 System Component (Customer reporting, interface & extension) Upgrades Implementation	\$1.4	\$1.1	2007-10-01	2007-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY08 Operations and Maintenance	\$13.2	\$11.7	2007-10-01	2007-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY03 Asset managements module implementation	\$0.2	\$0.2	2003-01-01	2003-01-01	2003-07-01	2003-07-01	100.00%	100.00%
FY03 Operations and Maintenance	\$1.4	\$1.4	2002-10-01	2002-10-01	2003-09-30	2003-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY04 Central Contractor Registration (CCR) Interface	\$0.0	\$0.0	2004-01-01	2004-01-01	2004-03-31	2004-03-31	100.00%	100.00%
FY04 Operations and Maintenance	\$2.8	\$2.9	2003-10-01	2003-10-01	2004-09-30	2004-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY05 Operations and Maintenance	\$2.9	\$2.9	2004-10-01	2004-10-01	2005-09-30	2005-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
FY06 Operations and Maintenance	\$3.3	\$12.1	2005-10-01	2005-10-01	2006-09-30	2006-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY09 System Component Upgrades Design & Development	\$2.8	\$2.6	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY09 System Component Upgrades Testing	\$1.7	\$1.2	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY09 System Component Upgrades Implementation	\$1.4	\$1.0	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY09 Operations and Maintenance	\$15.6	\$17.1	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FY09 CGAC Initiative	\$5.0	\$0.0	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY10 System Component Upgrades Design and Development	\$3.3	\$1.8	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		83.00%	83.00%
FY10 System Component Upgrades Testing	\$2.3	\$1.0	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		83.00%	83.00%
FY10 System Component Upgrades Implementation	\$1.8	\$0.9	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		83.00%	83.00%
FY10 Operations and Maintenance	\$17.7	\$13.7	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		83.00%	83.00%
FY10 CGAC Initiative	*	*	2009-10-01		2010-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY11 System Component Upgrades Design and Development	*	*	2010-10-01		2011-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY11 System Component Upgrades Testing	*	*	2010-10-01		2011-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY11 System Component Upgrades Implementation	*	*	2010-10-01		2011-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY11 Operations	*	*	2010-10-01		2011-09-30		0.00%	0.00%

1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
and Maintenance								
FY11 CGAC Initiative	*	*	2010-10-01		2011-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY12 System Component Upgrades Design and Development	*	*	2011-10-01		2012-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY12 System Component Upgrades Testing	*	*	2011-10-01		2012-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY12 System Component Upgrades Implementation	*	*	2011-10-01		2012-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY12 Operations and Maintenance	*	*	2011-10-01		2012-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY13 System Component Upgrades Design and Development	*	*	2012-10-01		2013-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY13 System Component Upgrades Testing	*	*	2012-10-01		2013-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY13 System Component Upgrades Implementation	*	*	2012-10-01		2013-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
FY13 Operations and Maintenance	*	*	2012-10-01		2013-09-30		0.00%	0.00%

\* - Indicates data is redacted.